

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Patrick Herz

CASE NO. C 07 0183 CW

Plaintiff(s),

STIPULATION AND ~~PROPOSED~~  
ORDER SELECTING ADR PROCESS

v.

Dynamax Corporation

Defendant(s).

Counsel report that they have met and conferred regarding ADR and have reached the following stipulation pursuant to Civil L.R. 16-8 and ADR L.R. 3-5:

The parties agree to participate in the following ADR process:

## Court Processes:

- ☐ Non-binding Arbitration (ADR L.R. 4)  
☐ Early Neutral Evaluation (ENE) (ADR L.R. 5)  
☒ Mediation (ADR L.R. 6)

(Note: Parties who believe that an early settlement conference with a Magistrate Judge is appreciably more likely to meet their needs than any other form of ADR, must participate in an ADR phone conference and may not file this form. They must instead file a Notice of Need for ADR Phone Conference. See Civil Local Rule 16-8 and ADR L.R. 3-5)

## Private Process:



- ☐ Private ADR (please identify process and provider) \_\_\_\_\_

The parties agree to hold the ADR session by:

- ☒ the presumptive deadline (The deadline is 90 days from the date of the order referring the case to an ADR process unless otherwise ordered.)  
☐ other requested deadline \_\_\_\_\_

Dated: March 30, 2007

Dated: 3-30-07

  
Attorney for Plaintiff  
Mark F. Anderson  
Attorney for Defendant

NDC-ADR

**[PROPOSED] ORDER**

Pursuant to the Stipulation above, the captioned matter is hereby referred to:

- ☐ Non-binding Arbitration  
☐ Early Neutral Evaluation (ENE)  
☒ Mediation  
☐ Private ADR

Deadline for ADR session

- ☒ 90 days from the date of this order.  
☐ other \_\_\_\_\_

IT IS SO ORDERED.

4/9/07

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_



UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE